5. If these conditions are not fully met and the government at the provincial or higher level deems it necessary to create a township, and have officially approved it, the place can be listed as an urban residential area.

According to a rough estimate based on these criteria, the urban population of China in 1984 and 1985 was 29.8 and 34 percent of the total population respectively. These figures are lower than the respective 31.9 and 36.6 percent figures of the State Statistical Bureau and take into account administrative criteria, demographic criteria, economic criteria, and geographic criteria, thereby better reflecting the real differences between urban and rural areas.

3

No matter what the criteria are, if they are to be used, it is necessary for us to understand the competing interests of various internal departments of administrative bodies in our government over the issue of the definition of urban and rural land. The strongest opposition to standardizing the criteria by which urban and rural areas are defined are the statistics departments themselves. They are strongly in favor of a definition by administrative units, so that the definition will be consistent with the current system of compiling statistics. The statistics departments feel that the rationality of the criteria themselves is of secondary importance. What is important to them is who will define the criteria and once the criteria are defined, who will be responsible for compiling the statistics. They would find it impossible to assume the heavy burden of compiling statistic on the basis of both administrative regions and standardized classifications. The State Planning Commission also frowned on major changes which would bring difficulties for a comprehensive balance in labor and wages, credit, and taxation. The Tax Bureau collects 7 percent, 5 percent, and 3 percent town-building tax from cities, towns, and villages respectively, and is, therefore, not interested in two different types of statistics on urban population. The Ministry of Finance would like to see more rigorous standards applied to the definition of urban and rural areas because the more than 9,100 townships now enjoying treatment as an urban entity will be a heavy burden. The public security, commercial, education, public health, and grain departments all have different definitions and measures for urban and rural areas, and it would be hard to enforce any arbitrary standardization. Whatever form the new criteria may take does not seem to matter much. Theoreticians try even harder to arrive at standardized criteria and comparability and welcome a standard definition of demarcation. In the face of the many competing interests and desired criteria, the State Council should adopt the following measures in addition to stressing the need to look at this issue from a nationwide perspective: (1) Increase the funds, personnel, and power of the statistical departments so that they can play their role more effectively as economic chiefs of staff. (2) Not change the rules of special departments. (3) Work out carefully and resolutely the criteria that will meet the requirements of economic development so that they will serve as a rational yardstick for economic zones and social zones. This is also an underlying requirement for modernization.

9411

Wang Ruoshui on Truth Criterion, Theory Research

40050370 Beijing WEI RENDAO ZHUYI BIANHU in Chinese 1986 pp 1-22

[Chapter from book "In Defence of Humanism" by Wang Ruoshui; Sanlian Shudian, 279 pages; transcription of a speech delivered at a forum held in Shanghai on 15 Aug 1979]

[Text]

Truth Criterion and Theory Research

The Theory of Scientific Socialism Should Be Developed in Practice

First, I'd like to talk about the issue of truth criterion. Bringing up this issue at the present is of not only domestic but also international significance. Marxism has been tested in practice for over a century since it was introduced. How do we look at it now? In the beginning of the 20th Century, the October revolution won a great victory. In the middle of the 20th Century, the Chinese revolution also won a great victory. These great events brilliantly proved the correctness of Marxism and exerted a far-reaching influence in the world. In the 1950's, the reputation of the imperialist camp was notorious while the influence of the socialist camp was growing among the people of the world who placed hope in the Soviet Union and China. However, in the past 20 years or so, things have changed. First, the Soviet Union had problems. Immediately after that, the socialist camp split. There followed 10 years of turmoil in China. Contrary to what happened on this side, capitalism had over 20 years of a "golden age." What does this explain? I think perhaps during these years Marxist theory has failed to develop along with the development of practice; therefore, it is probably already behind the international reality.

Marxist theory has three parts, and the most detailed one is political economy. "Das Kapital" was in line with the reality at its time. Later in the imperialist period, things were different. In the early 20th Century, Lenin wrote "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" and thereby solved the problems of that period. Now half a century has passed since then, the situation has changed drastically, and many new situations and phenomena have appeared in capitalist development. However, many of our comrades still try to understand capitalism only by reading books. Of course, we need to read Marx's "Das Kapital" and Lenin's "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," but what these books depicted



were situations in the last century or the early part of this century and many changes have occurred since then. Although essential and basic contradictions remain the same, many situations have indeed changed. Due to many years of isolation (resulting first from an imperialist blockade and then from our own closed-door policy), we did not understand the outside world. Due to the isolation and lack of study, we knew very little about the situations of capitalist countries. Even if we knew a little, we were too afraid to talk about it. Now that our door is open, we find that things are different from books. Students have raised many questions, and the theoretical circle also feels the need to think about many issues. We now need a book—not one book but many books—that analyzes, from all angles, new phenomena which have appeared in capitalist countries during the past few decades since the introduction of "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" and gives Marxist answers to new questions and on new situations. Of course, we do not have another Lenin; nor did Chairman Mao write such a book. Then what shall we do? I think, instead of waiting for some talent to show up, we should rely on collective power—the collective power of theoretical workers—to explore and study and gain new knowledge from years of research and discussion, which is also developing Marxist political economy.

Lenin said imperialism was moribund capitalism. He even then predicted that the capitalist system was dying. Of course, several dacades could also be considered a dying period in history. It takes not just one or two decades for a system to die; it could take several decades or even a century. This is understandable. But the question is since Lenin's book "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," especially since World War II, the capitalist economy, in general, has had many crises as well as rapid developments, resulting in higher living standards for workers and a so-called "golden age." How come a dying system has a "golden age?" In addition, some new capitalist countries have emerged in some areas and they are developing very rapidly. For instance, Singapore and South Korea are making rapid economic progress. This explains that Chairman Mao's thesis in "The Theory of New Democracy" that there could not be another Kemal is proved incorrect in practice. Then, is it justified to describe the present capitalist world with such adjectives as rapidly declining and moribound? There are two estimates and based on them we can develop two kinds of foreign strategic principles. If we think the capitalist system is dying, we should hurry up and get prepared for the world revolution. Didn't we use to say during the "cultural revolution" that "now is the time for imperialism to head to a complete collapse and for socialism to head to a world-wide victory?" Lin Biao also thought that way. He believed that cities were surrounded by rural areas all over the world and he wanted to overthrow U.S. imperialism, Soviet revisionism, and everything else. He was an extreme "Leftist." Another estimate is that in spite of crises, capitalism still has some life in it. I have been abroad only a few times. Last year I went to the United States and saw there were indeed many contradictions including economic problems, inflation, and an energy crisis, which gave them great headaches, but they are far from dying or rapidly declining. When a system is dying, it should be fairly easy to detect. Even if you are there only for 20 days or a month, you should be able to find traces of decline in social conditions and the psychological conditions of the people. Like Comrade Ba Jin said in his novel "Home:" I am denouncing a dying system; that system is indeed dying for feudal things are withering one after another. Judged from the current situation, the force of life is still growing in the framwork of capitalist production relations. Therefore, I wonder if the life of capitalism is longer than what Lenin predicted or if it was probably too early for Lenin to say that capitalism was at a dying stage. We should be able to study these questions. At that time, it was impossible for Lenin to make accurate predictions on certain things. I think Lenin probably could not imagine or predict the rapid developments in the science, technology, and productive forces of today's capitalist world. Take polarization for instance. Marx said in "Das Kapital" that as capitalism develops, there will be an increasingly large number of poor proletarians on the one side and millionaires on the other. In other words, the entire society will be polarized into the shape of a gourd—big on one end, small on the other, and very skinny in the middle—and the middle class and petty bourgeoisie will be drawn to both ends. What is the current situation of capitalist society? There are large numbers of middle-class people. Under this circumstance, we should forget about books, proceed strictly from reality, and test theory with practice. If a theory contradicts reality, we should revise it. We should never distort facts to accommodate theories by saying that the peoples of capitalist countries are impoverished, that they will rebel any minute, that they are just sitting on a powder magazine that will explode any time, and that they will be doomed as soon as it explodes. Because, it would be unrealistic. American workers strike, too, but they are not opposing the capitalist system. They want higher wages. We visited the United Auto Workers union in Detroit. A union official told us that they were willing to cooperate with capitalists, but capitalists refused to cooperate, so they had to fight. He believed that everything could be solved through legal struggle and he had no intention of overthrowing the capitalist system. We cannot just say you American workers have such a low level of class consciousness, you are corrupted, and etc. I think we should do more than make critical remarks on this issue, for it reflects the objective existence of a situation; whereas the task of Marxism is to recognize facts as they are in an objective manner and to answer such questions through Marxist analysis. We should not be afraid of such things. Now that our foreign relations have been established and more and more people have come in and out of our country, our youth begin to have problems, thinking that capitalism is superior. In the past these young people did not understand and thought capitalism was a complete mess. Now

they understand a little about the surface of capitalism, but not enough, so they think that capitalism is superior and that our socialism, in comparison, has failed.

What is socialism exactly? It was impossible to have a complete theory of socialism during Marx' time because Marx only laid a foundation for scientific socialism. It is impossible to say that the theory of scientific socialism is complete because socialism has not been carried out. How can there be a complete theory on socialism without the practice? We have tested and developed the theory through Soviet and Chinese practice of socialism in the past several decades. Even today, many questions have yet to be resolved, many objective laws are waiting to be studied and experiences reviewed. As the central government pointed out, we should build a socialism to suit China's national conditions and develop productive forces as soon as possible. This includes absorbing the good experiences of other countries.

This involves the question of how to uphold socialism. First, we should understand what is real and what is fake socialism. Only by thoroughly criticizing the fake socialism of the "Gang of Four" can we uphold real socialism. Second, socialism has more than one model. As long as the general principle is the same, socialism could be carried out in a hundred different ways. Before we only knew how to copy the Soviet Union. We did it because the Soviet Union was the only socialist country at the time. Later we criticized the Soviet Union but we were still thinking in the same way. We thought there was only one way to achieve socialism, no alternatives. Only by comparing can one distinguish and recognize. Only after comparing our methods with those of other countries such as Yugoslavia and Romania did we find out that there could be different methods. Therefore, to uphold socialism, we should have a clear understanding of these issues. This also explains that we cannot uphold socialism unless we emancipate our thinking. Upholding socialism does not mean maintaining the status quo and copying everything indiscriminately. We should not copy the 10 years of the "cultural revolution"; nor should we copy the 17 years before the "cultural revolution." Of course, certain things should still be done in accordance with the methods used during that 17 years, but they are not sufficient. We must create new methods to solve new problems. Failing to solve these problems will make upholding socialism impossible. Because of this, we should not advocate emancipating our thinking under the prerequisite of the four upholds. I disagree with this view. We should reverse it—only by persisting in emancipating thinking can we uphold socialism. You say we need to uphold socialism, but what kind of socialism? There is no fixed model for socialism, then what is the method most suited to China's conditions? We should let the public discuss these questions. How can they discuss anything if their thinking is not emancipated? Some erroneous and popular views of the past are mistaken for the only way to socialism. For instance, socialism does not allow recruits so everybody must be assigned under socialism; otherwise, if workers are recruited, it would not be socialism. What is this nonsense? For another instance, the planned economy, which is also waiting to be studied, may be practiced in different ways. Only by so doing can we develop the theory of socialism. How can we develop the theory of socialism if we do not emancipate our thinking? Many practices cannot be continued. Since Stalin's problems cropped up, the Soviet Union realized that they could not succeed by copying all of Stalin' methods and that they had to make some changes. Chairman Mao also realized this fact and tried to create some new methods. As a result, when Chairman Mao criticized dogmatism before the year 1957, he urged us to think before copying the Soviet Union so that we could learn from their positive experiences and draw lessons from their negative ones. The Soviet Union also changed. They attached importance to material incentive or material reward—I cannot find much difference between the meanings of these two phrases after consulting with many dictionaries. The Soviet Union has indeed taken this road. In 1958 we put politics in command. Later we engaged in class struggle, using it to determine everything, as the key link, and to promote production. After all these years, if we look back and use practice to test the several theories which guided us through these years, we would find out—we need not to be evasive—that the 10 years of turmoil has pushed the national economy to the brink of collapse. How can you afford not to review this theory? How can you refuse to recognize such a practice?

Many people at home and abroad say that we have turned into "revisionists" and that our line has changed. It is true that our line has changed. It was the ultra-left guiding ideology that occupied a dominant position during the "cultural revolution." How can we afford not to change it? But, changing the line is not the same as revisionism. In fact, the "revisionist line" is not an appropriate term. Why? Revisionism initially was referred to the theory of Bernstein and his like. It was a theoretical issue. If a theory contradicts the basic tenets of Marxism, it is called revisionism. As for the issue of line, it is either Left or Right opportunist line; there is no revisionist line. The basic tenets of Marxism are universal truth which is a criterion for the whole wide world. "Revising" such a criterion is the same as opposing Marxism and thus should be objected. We cannot say a basic tenet was good yesterday but is no good today because it covers a very long period of time. As for the line itself, it should change as situations change. We had one line for the period of democratic revolution and another for the period of socialist revolution. We even had different lines for different stages of the socialist period. Therefore, the term, the revisionist line, gives people an illusion as if there ought to be a permanent line that will stay the same forever like "doing everything according to existing principles" which was advocated by the "Gang of Four." You have to do everything according to existing principles and lines; otherwise, you are revisionists—this is the exact logic Liang Xiao [2733 2400] used in his article carried by the "GUANGMING RIBAO." It says: After Marx died, Engels waged a

struggle against opportunism according to existing principles; after Engels died, Lenin followed Marx' and Engels' existing principles; later Stalin followed Lenin's existing principles; and Chairman Mao too followed existing principles. As a result, our current principles are still Marx' principles. This is absolutely absurd metaphysics.

All I mean is that socialism still needs to be shaped and there is a vast world where much can be accomplished by our theoretical and other workers in this field. To do so, we must emancipate our thinking. Therefore, I say there is no scientific basis for the argument that Chairman Mao had a complete set of theories on socialist revolution. How can there be a complete theory of socialism before socialist construction is completed? It is of course possible for theory to precede practice, but theory could not be completed before practice is completed. Do we have a complete understanding of capitalism? No, we do not. After "Das Kapital" we had to study "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism." After "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" we had to study other aspects of capitalism. When will we be able to complete our understanding of capitalism? After the death of capitalism. Only then can we study the whole process of birth, development, and death and thereby complete our understanding of capitalism. We cannot even complete our understanding of capitalism not to mention socialism. Therefore, we must emancipate our thinking to develop Marxism. People used to think in the past that theoretical issue was only a leader's responsibility. This idea came from the Soviet Union and Chinese tradition. Each dynasty had a sage such as Yao, Shun, Yu, Tang, Wen, Wu, Zhougong, Confucius, and Mencius. Only their words can be used for criterion or the so-called "Confucian Orthodoxy" and other people's words are worthless. A theory should be developed by the collective including the masses of people and theoretical workers, and everybody can make a contribution and help develop it. We are all fools, but even a fool can occasionally hit on a good idea. By adding such ideas together, we would be able to improve our theory. For many years we were not used to thinking for ourselves; we used to wait for the central government and Chairman Mao to say something and then we would do whatever Chairman Mao told us to do. Now we cannot rely on them anymore. We need to study many teachings of Chairman Mao, but there are no ready-made answers to many new questions. This forces us to think for ourselves, thus bringing life and hope back to our theoretical work. There still may be great development in China's theoretical undertaking.

Marxism and Mao Zedong Thought Permit Inquiries and Criticisms

I'd like to address another issue: how to treat Marxism and Mao Zedong Thought. When we bring up the issue of the four upholds, we should not set it against the liberation of our thinking because we need to emancipate our thinking to uphold Marxism and Mao Zedong Thought; otherwise, we cannot uphold Marxism and Mao Zedong Thought.

I think that after years of practice, Chairman Mao's 1957 speech on correctly handling contradictions among the people has been proved basically correct. Restoring some of the theses in this speech which have been forgotten and abandoned is exactly what we need to do now. For instance, the phrase that the class struggle has been basically completed is a long-forgotten sentence and we have started to mention it again. There are also some problems. During the same socialist period, first he said that the class struggle was basically completed and later he said that it should be discussed yearly, monthly, and daily. These two sentences contradict. If one of them is the truth, the other would not be. So it is impossible for every sentence to be the truth; neither is it possible for us to follow every instruction. Since the tenets of a complete system usually are consistent, the inconsistency of its tenets explains that our understanding of socialist construction and revolution has not been completed. Chairman Mao urged us in 1962 to understand the realm of necessity—the socialist construction of China and we have not been able to accomplish it. When did we complete our understanding of democratic revolution? As far as the theoretical system was concerned, we did not set forth the general line for the new democratic revolution—namely, a revolution led by the proletariat and the masses of people to oppose imperialism, feudalism, and bureaucratic capitalism—until 1948 right before the victory of the democratic revolution. Later in the article "On the People's Democratic Dictatorship," he was still reviewing this experience, but by that time the theory was complete because the practice of democratic revolution was completed and the theory was tested to be correct. Now we have this problem: Some instructions contradict others and we cannot follow every one of them. What do we do? There is only one thing we can do—we resolutely follow those instructions which have been proved correct in practice in accordance with the criterion of practice. So, quoting a sentence from Chairman Mao's 1957 speech—the large-scale, violent mass class struggle has been basically completed—at the 3rd Plenary Session of the 11th Party Central Committee does not mean that we stick to each and every instruction. Instead, it means that this instruction has been proved correct after over 20 years of practice. Why did we not quote other words? We did not quote other words because they have not been tested in practice. These questions not only concern our attitude toward our leaders and political stand but also concern the success and failure and the life and death of socialism in our country. Some people still cannot get over the lingering fear. They say, you are probably right now, but what happens if there is another "cultural revolution." I say, if there is another "cultural revolution," whether or not you will be criticized would not constitute an issue because the issue would be whether or not the nation and the party will survive.

That Marxism permits criticism was originally an idea advanced by Chairman Mao in his 1957 report on contradictions among the people. Chairman Mao said: Marxism has been considered as a guiding ideology in our country, then can we criticize it? Of course. Marxism would be useless if it were afraid to be criticized. Instead of being afraid of criticism, Marxism invites it in order to develop during the struggle. In fact, the petty bourgeoisie, bourgeoisie, and other people are criticizing Marxism every day, aren't they? They criticize it every day. Some are fair criticisms and others are not. Can you stop them from criticizing? No, it is impossible.

We have to distinguish between opposing socialism and opposing Marxism and between doubting socialism and opposing socialism in action. In China, socialism is our basic system and the overwhelming majority of people support it. So you cannot oppose it. Nowadays, some young people are confused. They doubt socialism and do not understand what socialism is. They thought the iron rice bowl and eating from the same big pot 12 months a year means socialism. What does that have anything to do with socialism? They do not know and we cannot blame them. We should blame ourselves, for we did not do a good job. If you oppose socialism in action, like instigating a group of people, founding some kind of an organization, or calling on the people to overthrow socialism, then, sorry, you would be violating the criminal law. It is of course allowed to have some doubts about socialism. It is also allowed to have some doubts about Marxism. Why can't we have doubts about it since Chairman Mao said it was Okay to criticize it? We should distinguish between party and non-party members. If a party member says I don't believe in Marxism or Mao Zedong Thought at all, we should ask: Why did you join the party? It is not strange for the masses outside the party to have different kinds of thinking. We should use a proletarian world outlook to educate and reform them, which is a long-term task. All non-proletarian thinkings including the anti-Marxist thinking will exist for a long time to come. We should educate or criticize people with such thoughts but we cannot prohibit such thoughts, according to Chairman Mao. What can we do about the anti-Marxist thinking? If our enemies have such thoughts, it will be easy—just forbid their talking. What happens if it is one of our people? We can only let him talk first and then educate and criticize him by reasoning with and talking to him.

Therefore, first, we should not be afraid of criticism; second, we cannot possibly stop them from criticizing; and third we should permit criticism. Is criticism good or bad to Marxism? It is good. Many people are scared to death as if allowing criticism could damage our stand and Mao Zedong Thought. I say Chairman Mao himself thought differently. He said: Marxism develops during the process of a struggle and it stops when people stop criticizing. To prevent Marxism from turning into dogmatism, an important measure is to allow a hundred schools to contend.

I can tell you something else. In April 1957, I met Chairman Mao and heard him say face to face that Marxism, including the basic tenets of Marxism, permits criticism. He said it did not sound good to say it is Okay to criticize the individual theories of Marxism but not the basic tenets of Marxism. So, when he wrote his speech, he just said in a general term that Marxism can be criticized.

But, we did not follow his instruction. Later at a propaganda work conference, someone said that a hundred schools referred to only two schools—capitalist and proletarian, thus confusing the issue of allowing a hundred schools to contend. All thinkings were categorized into either bourgeois or proletarian. In other words, if you were not bourgeois, you must be proletarian. What belonged to the bourgeoisie? Everything that was wrong, as if the proletarian ideology was so pure that it could not have any mistake at all whereas the bourgeoisie had all the mistakes. As a result, every ideology was labeled. This practice may be traced further back to "The Theory of Practice" where there was a sentence saying that all ideologies were stamped with the brand of a class. Of course many ideologies were stamped with the brand of a class, but does every ideology have a class nature? Later during the "Great Cultural Revolution," this sentence became the basis for the theory of blood relationship. You were branded with a class as soon as you were born. The brands of certain classes were especially deep, such as the "son of a bitch" class and the four black categories. The several red categories were also branded with a class which was born red. These brands of classes could never be erased. Can we categorize all ideologies into either bourgeois or proletarian? Many ideologies have a class nature but many don't. What kind of a class nature does the thinking of natural science such as Einstein's theory of relativity have? What class does social science such as Morgan's ancient sociology belong to? Another question is: Are there only two classes? Can landlords be considered a class? Can farmers and small producers be considered a class? How about the petty bourgeoisie in urban areas? How come we only singled out the bourgeoisie? Since only two classes were noticed, someone later put forward the slogan of eliminating bourgeois ideology and fostering proletarian ideology as if on the ideological front all we had to fight was only one bourgeois ideology. When did we criticize the influence of feudalism and petty production over all these years? Never. In fact, we saw that feudal influence was much greater and worse than bourgeois influence. What we did was let slip by the thinkings of the landlord class and feudalism. As a result, feudal thinking emerged during the criticism of the bourgeoisie. For instance, during the "Great Cultural Revolution," women were not allowed to wear skirts or braids. I also saw a big-character poster opposing men and women swimming together and saying that women's swimsuits looked ridiculous in the pool. I think in the past 20 years we have failed to raise anti-feudalism to a proper level on our ideological front. The fact that the government work report at this people's congress mentioned the issue of anti-feudalism indicates

great progress. As I mentioned before, someone at a propaganda work conference said that a hundred schools referred to only two schools, which was however changed in the "May 16 Circular." Originally we were told that various erroneous thinkings among the people should be criticized and corrected through persuasion and reasoning, not by coercion. Problems in the ideological sphere cannot be solved by holding one or two meetings; they should be solved by presenting the facts and reasoning things out. Later, the "May 16 Circular" criticized the view that everybody is equal before the truth. In other words, the bourgeoisie could not enjoy equality and they had to be suppressed. It demanded that the proletariat exercise dictatorship over the bourgeoisie in the sphere of superstructure including the ideological sphere. Such a dictatorship made it impossible for a hundred schools to contend. Therefore, a hundred schools contending became two schools contending, which later became one school singing solo. What was the last school? Was it Marxism? No, it was the school of Lin Biao and the "Gang of Four."

The movement of combating and preventing revisionism originally was to oppose changing the basic tenets of Marxism. Later, it turned into a movement to establish absolute authority for a leader and ensuring that China will never change its political color also became a means to establish a leader's absolute authority. Every word this authority said was absolutely correct and did not need to be tested through practice. Whoever criticized or violated some of his words before or after he died would be likened to Khruschev, accused of opposing Mao Zedong Thought, and considered a bad guy to be punished by the whole party and nation. As a result, in the process of combating and preventing revisionism, a personality cult gained ground. In 1956, we drew lessons from Soviet experiences and wrote an article, "On the Historical Experience of Proletarian Dictatorship," to criticize Stalin's personality cult, which was the right thing to do. In the report to the Eighth National People's Congress on the amendment of the Party Constitution, Comrade Deng Xiaoping said there was a reflection of a personality cult inside our party. Later, this view was changed. On the issue of Stalin, the second criticism of the "Nine Criticisms," which was adapted from the speech of a certain "adviser," never even mentioned the mistakes of his personality cult. Instead, it said criticizing personality cult was completely wrong for it violated Lenin's theories on the masses, class, political parties, and leaders, thus paving the way for the development of a personality cult and resulting in serious and disastrous consequences. These views all violated the criterion of truth. Lenin's teachings on the masses, class, political parties, and leaders is that the masses are of different classes, the party represents classes, and leaders represent the party. It is true that leaders represent the party, classes, and the masses, but we cannot say that everything a leader does must represent the masses, that believing in leaders means believing in the masses, and that the personality cult does not exist. Leaders can also depart from the people; therefore, not every word and deed of leaders absolutely, undoubtedly conform to the people's interests. Leaders sometimes can make mistakes. Chairman Mao himself once said: "No party or person can avoid making mistakes." Lin Biao advocated that "everything Chairman Mao said is the truth." I'd like to ask him: Isn't this remark of Chairman Mao also the truth? Chairman Mao said no one, including himself of course, can avoid commiting mistakes. This remark must also be the truth if whatever Chairman Mao said is the truth as Lin Biao advocated. However, if this remark is the truth, "whatever he said is the truth" would become impossible. Due to many years of propaganda, this view has been ingrained; therefore, trying to set things right, solving these problems, and emancipating our thinking has become a very arduous task. This requires a certain process. Of course, we should also realize and notice that some people oppose our efforts to set things right because they are on the side of the "Gang of Four." But a large number of masses have no bad intention. They are against the "Gang of Four," but since they have had too much of this propaganda and have not paid much attention to their political study, they resent what we are trying to do now. Our RENMIN RIBAO has received many letters, especially from PLA soldiers, protesting: Don't attack people here and there by innuendo and stop doing such things. These comrades are good comrades. They do not necessarily think that Chairman Mao had made no mistakes. It is just that they can not accept this psychologically. We need to carry out propaganda steadily. Propaganda needs discipline, but what kind? It is very hard to say. It is a process. We cannot say certain things during a certain period; but after a while, it will be all right. Maybe we cannot say this today, but we will be able to say it after a certain period. Therefore, we need to advance steadily and help some people by working with them to change their thinking, but never hurt their feelings.

We should advance steadily not only in propaganda but also in all fields including democratic and reform issues. Old bad practices die hard. We now have so many problems which are forming not a pile but a mountain. So, when we sort out these problems, we can only work at a steady pace. We should not vacillate. Vacillation is no good. Don't vacillate, advance steadily. This is why we cannot discuss certain things now but we will be able to after a while. Take the issue of sham leftist and real rightist, for example. Some people say that this still has not been corrected, and I agree. When an article on this issue was first published, it was risky to talk about an issue which was considered a forbidden zone. Chairman Mao said himself that Lin Biao was an extreme rightist. The only way to indicate sham leftist, real rightist was by placing quotation marks around the word "leftist." You now say he was an extreme leftist, so now an unquoted leftist has come to mean sham, and a quoted "leftist" means real. Later after the situation developed, it was all right to talk about the extreme leftist line. Therefore, things are developing and ideological liberation requires a process. Eliminating the forbidden zone also requires a process. For instance, the Liu Shaoqi forbidden zone has

so be eliminated sooner or later and it will involve even more areas. Many people have already had too much of this. They say: We redress mishandled cases everyday. Why are there so many cases to be redressed? A large part of the masses think the same way. What do you thik about their thinking? In a certain sense, their thinking is still under the pernicious influence of the ultra-leftist thinking of the "Gang of Four." In another sense, their thinking is lagging behind the situation. The situation has developed and the focus has been shifted, but they still stay in the past talking about things like taking the class struggle or this and that as the key link. So based on this point, their thinking is conservative. There are actually two common definitions for "leftists" and rightists as Chairman Mao pointed out. One definition is: One who emphasizes struggle, excessive struggle, is a leftist; one who lacks the spirit of struggle is a rightist. Another definition is: One who does things which should be done in the future, going too far, is called a "leftist", one who refuses to do things which should have been done and stays in the past is called a "rightist." Although practice has changed, many people with ossified thinking have failed to change their thinking along with the change of practice, so in this sense they are considered as conservatives who have fallen behind.

The Issue of Socialist Democracy Should Be Resolved

Many socialist countries have not yet resolved this issue. Failure to resolve this issue has caused many problems for the Soviet Union. What about us? We have not resolved it either. We always thought democracy was an issue of work style. For many years we advertised: Democracy is to let the people speak, refrain from bludgeoning and putting labels on people, and heed the opinions of the masses. We thought this was what democracy was all about. It is of course democracy but the major meaning of democracy should not be limited to this area. This formulation is to urge leaders to heed the opinions of the masses, let the people speak, and allow them to express their opinions. According to this formulation which is based on the viewpoint of the leaders', democracy is possible even in a feudal society. Due to the deep influence of feudal ideology, our discussion of democracy has been limited to how leaders should understand the people. An upright feudal official and a good emperor could be democratic if they accepted others' advice. Of course we hope that leaders are like this, but the question is what do we do if they aren't. Nothing. Now we have to correct this misunderstanding. First, democracy is the system of a country under which the people have the right not only to criticize but also to supervise, vote, recall, and etc. I attended the people's congress and felt that some progress has been made. At the congress, representatives criticized state leaders by name and those criticisms were sharp and unprecedented. Many representatives responded to the issue of personal privileges, which is a good phenomenon. However, all this is just preliminary. The important question is the principle of the *Paris Commune*. Before when we discussed the principle and experience of the Paris Commune, people like Yao Wenyuan and Chen Boda always wrote articles to blame the failure on the lack of suppression on the enemy. Today when we discuss the principle of the Paris Commune, we concentrate on how to prevent leaders from changing from the people's public servants into the people's masters. The Paris Commune had two methods: one is general election and the other, the low-wage system. The low-wage system, under which leaders are paid the same amount of wage as workers, is not feasible today, but at least personal privileges should be eliminated.

We cannot expect "upright officials" to do all this for us. We have to rely on ourselves and fight. Whether it is economic reform, political democracy, or ideological liberation, there is always a fight and many things demand of us to get up and fight. This is a very important experience and lesson. If there were more comrades like Zhang Zhixin [1728 1807 2450] in the past, many things would not have been in such a mess. Zhang Zhixin was a hero of the socialist period and we need such an example. In the old days, things were simple. Whoever opposed the Kuomintang became a hero, of course, and whoever got shot became a martyr who will be remembered by the people. Under the new conditions, whoever has differing views becomes a revisionist who will go down in history as a byword of infamy and whoever opposes Mao Zedong Thought becomes a disgraced element of the three evils who cannot even gain the understanding of the people. It is not very easy to take this kind of mental pressure. None of us is mentally prepared for such a struggle in the socialist period. In the past, when we fought the Kuomintang and Japanese, we could easily tell right from wrong and we felt superior to our enemies if we died and became heroes. However, in the socialsit period, since the party and leaders have high prestige, we always feel like we are wrong, wondering if we lack ideological consciousness, if we are wrong after all, and if we will go down in history labelled as a byword of infamy and humiliation. This indeed poses a mental pressure. So I said Comrade Zhang Zhixin was wonderful. She noticed the problems very early. She was also alone because at the time everybody else, not knowing the problems, was still talking about the "three bests" and the "red sun." Comrade Zhang Zhixin's criticism on Chairman Mao came from love and respect not vicious attacks. I heard that comrades of Liaoning Province decided to rehabilitate Comrade Zhang Zhixin after they read the documents of the ideological work conference and found that there were criticisms on Chairman Mao because Comrade Zhang Zhixin's criticism was not as serious as those at the ideological work conference. She was great because she was alone and many good comrades and people around her did not understand and opposed her. It was not easy for her to persist under such a circumstance. Zhang Zhixin was the vanguard of ideological liberation

Ideological liberation is to free us from various kinds of ideologies such as idealism, old dogmatism, superstitions, and prejudice that prevent us from understanding

the truth so that we can seek and understand the truth freely and independently. The purpose of ideological liberation is to understand the truth and the criterion of truth is practice. As long as we recognize this rule, we would not have to worry about the problem of overdoing in ideological liberation. Today, we still need to liberate our thinking.

Some comrades asked me how to explain democracy as a means. If democracy is a means, so is dictatorship. We have no reason to belittle the importance of democracy just because we think it as a means. Is dictatorship a means? Yes, it is also a means. As Marx said, dictatorship is a medium to ultimately eliminate classes. If we can stress the means of dictatorship, why can't we stress the means of democracy? This is the first question. The second question is that a means and an end are relative and can be transformed. For instance, when we were opposing the Kuomintang, we fought for democracy which was our end; after we won democracy, we used it to build socialism and democracy became a means. At the present, democracy, I think, is both a means and an end because we still need to develop socialist democracy so we can use it to arouse the people's enthusiasm for the cause of the four modernizations.

On the Issue of Chairman Mao's Philosophical Thinking

How do we look at Chairman Mao's philosophical thinking? What are his contributions and shortcomings? I can only talk about it briefly because I am not prepared and don't have any reference materials. I can only say a few things based on my memory.

While discussing these issues, including Chairman Mao's theories on epistemology and contradictions, we should go far back to the philosophical difference between Chairman Mao and Stalin. Lenin wrote "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" which was the first Marxist classic to discuss mainly epistemology. No book was devoted to the discussion of epistemology before then. However, this book is to resolve the issue of materialism and criticize idealism. It also talks about the dialectics of epistemology, but not much. It mainly answers questions such as what is primary and what is secondary. Later he began to write "Notes on Philosophy" and learned Hegel's science of logic. He finished writing outlines and introduced many thinkings. It looked like he was ready to write another book on philosophy, but he did not have enough time to do so. In his "Notes on Philosophy," Lenin had two Ideas: one is to summarize the gist of dialectics into the unity of opposites, thus getting to the heart of the issue, which however should be explained and expanded on; the other is to apply dialectics to the theory of reflection. In addition, he also said that the road to knowledge is from vivid perception to abstract thinking and then from thinking to practice. For a long time in the Soviet Union, Ideas like this failed to attract Stalin's attention. Since Stalin looked down on Hegel and dialectics, for a long time the Soviet Union attached much importance to "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" but did not give due attention to "Notes on Philosophy." Under Soviet influence, China also attached importance to "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" and ignored "Notes on Philosophy." "Notes on Philosophy" is only notes not a book but it contains the embryos of many valuable ideas. However, Chairman Mao inherited and developed these ideas first by expanding on Lenin's remark on the unity of the opposites into an article, entitled "The Theory of Contradictions" and, second, by expanding Lenin's idea on the process of cognition into an article, entitled "The Theory of Practice." Chairman Mao's articles were written in 1937, and "The Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" was published in 1938. Stalin wrote one of the chapters, entitled "Dialectical and Historical Materialism" which exerted great influence and played a great part. This article expounds on the general guidelines of the tenets of Marxist philosophy in simple and clear language and carries a certain amount of weight. However, it also has several mistakes which I will not discuss at length today. One of the mistakes is, as everybody knows, that when he discussed the four characteristics of dialectics, he only mentioned that the struggle of opposites in contradictions pushes things to move forward. Lenin's original remarks were two sentences: one was "development is the identity of opposites" and the other was "development is the struggle of opposites." Stalin used only the second sentence and dropped the first one. Another thing about his article is that it did not give enough coverage to the issue of epistemology. As if epistemology is merely an issue of the knowability and unknowability of the world, he said that the materialism thinks the world is knowable and idealism thinks the world is unknowable. And that is all he said about the issue of epistemology. Earlier in 1937, Chairman Mao already elaborated on this issue; so it is in these areas that Chairman Mao inherited and developed Lenin's thinking and these are also Chairman Mao's contributions.

Lenin's original remarks on the process from vivid perception to abstract thinking and then from abstract thinking to practice later aroused some questions. For example, how many stages are there in the process of cognition? One group says there are two: one is perceptual and the other, rational. They say according to "The Theory of Practice," knowledge is perceptual in the lower stage and rational in the higher stage; so there are two stages. Another group says there are three stages, contending that rational knowledge is not the end of the process and that there should be another stage for the testing of practice, which is also what Chairman Mao said. Rational knowledge, which is only the half point in the process of cognition, needs to go back to the stage of practice. This is the continuous development of knowledge.

What is our answer to this question? Chairman Mao elaborated on this issue in his work "Where Does Man's Correct Thinking Come From" where he said that one

stage is from practice to knowledge and another stage is from knowledge to practice. In this sense, the process of cognition has two stages—one from the beginning of practice to knowledge and the other, the return of knowledge to practice. This is the development of Lenin's idea because according to Lenin the process consists of vivid perception, abstract thinking, and practice in that order. Since this puts practice at the end of the process of cognition, practice only plays the role of testing. In fact, practice is the foundation of the whole process of cognition; it is not only the beginning but also the end of the process. This shows the shortcoming of Lenin's formulation. In addition, since the process begins with perception, this theory is also acceptable to idealism. Lenin said that proceeding from perception, one may take the road of subjectivism leading to idealism or materialism. Therefore, we should say that the process begins from practice and that there are two stages between practice and knowledge: one is perceptual and the other, rational knowledge. This is my view. Knowledge should of course return to practice to be tested, but there are only two forms of knowledge: perceptual and rational. Are there any other forms? I say no. How can knowledge return to practice to be tested? It is simple. First we gain perceptual knowledge in practice and then elevate it to rational knowledge. Practice itself does not equal knowledge. For instance, the 10-year "Great Cultural Revolution" was a test for our basic line, or the theory of continuous revolution, and the theory of sharpening the class struggle. This 10-year period was used to test this theory. How? Like I said before, first we discovered through perceptual knowledge many wronged cases, economic problems, and lower living standards and then we elevated and combined many different kinds of perceptual knowledge, turned them into rational knowledge, and then concluded that the theory of sharpening the class struggle is wrong. When we review our experiences, we also use practice as the criterion for judgement which is formulated on the basis of perceptual and rational knowledge; therefore, as far as the form of knowledge is concerned, there are only two stages. In sum, we should affirm Chairman Mao's philosophical development and achievements. It is not right to ignore "The Theory of Practice" and stress only "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism."

Then, is Chairman Mao's philosophical thinking perfect? Of course not. For instance, I think "The Theory of Practice" also has insufficient areas or shortcomings. Here I will discuss only one question: what is perceptual and rational knowledge? According to "The Theory of Practice," perceptual knowledge reflects the appearance of things and is a stage of sense perceptions and impressions; after this stage repeats for several times, a sudden change will take place and form conception, judgement, inference, or rational knowledge, which reflects the essence of things. So perceptual knowledge is different from rational knowledge. One difference is that rational knowledge is conception and judgement while perceptual knowledge is impression and sense perception. Another difference is that perceptual knowledge reflects appearance while rational knowledge reflects essence. This formulation is questionable. Does it mean that there is no concept or judgement in the stage of perceptual knowledge? Let me give you an example. I say this cup is white. Is this perceptual or rational knowledge? By saying that this cup is white, I reflected the appearance. But didn't I reflect any concept or judgement? The cup is a concept and so is the color white. That the cup is white is a judgement but this judgement does not reflect the essence of the cup. So I think there is conception and judgement in the stage of perceptual knowledge and we don't automatically understand the essence of things as soon as we gain concepts. Let's look at one of Chairman Mao's own example: The first part of the Chinese people's struggle against imperialism was the stage of perceptual knowledge and so was the long-term spontaneous struggle of the working class against capitalism. Were there any concept or judgement during that stage? Of course there were, but those concepts and judgements only reflected the appearance of things. We often use concepts and judgements in our daily life, but many of such concepts and judgements reflect only the appearance not the essence of things. So we cannot say that the formation of a concept automatically leads to the essence of things. Not necessarily. The difference between a concept and a sense perception is that the former masters the common characteristics and appearances of things and summarizes the common characteristics of things. Of course, essence can be reflected only by concepts, but this does not mean that all concepts reflect the essence of things. We now have many concepts. For instance, the concept of capitalism existed before Marxism, but then it did not reflect the essence of capitalism. The concept of the noun commodity existed long time ago, but it took economists several thousand years to study, from classical economics to Marx, before they finally understood the essence of commodity. Therefore, after a concept is formed, we usually have to go through a fairly long development stage before we can master the essence of things. For another instance, since the 1940's, there have been people reporting that they saw flying objects which did not look like airplanes or anything else. More and more people saw them but nobody knew what they were. So after failing to find their name after much research, we named them "flying saucers" which foreigners called "UFO—namely unidentified flying objects. Is this a concept? "Flying saucers"—unidentified flying objects—is a concept. But what exactly is this unidentified flying object or "flying saucer?" Is it sent by the people of another planet or an illusion? We don't know. We need to conduct research and prolonged studies and collect data before we can finally judge what exactly is a "flying saucer" and understand its essence. For still another instance, when did we learn the essence of men? Marx did. He said men's essence is the combination of social relations, so he grasped the essence of men. But, didn't the concept of men exist before then? Aristotle said men are rational animals and others said men are ...there were many concepts. Franklin said men are tool-making animals, which was affirmed by Marx. Therefore, the process of learning the essence of things is

much more difficult than that described in "The Theory of Practice." We don't understand the essence of things as soon as we obtain rational knowledge by eliminating the false and retaining the true in perceptual knowledge. Chairman Mao said after "The Theory of Practice" that some knowledge is incomplete and its onesidedness can be corrected through the test of practice; some knowledge is erroneous and its mistakes can be corrected through the test of practice. When he said correcting mistakes, he referred to mistakes in rational knowledge. It is thus clear that rational knowledge does not necessarily reflects the essence of things and that it needs to be tested in practice. Therefore, it is wrong to say that once a concept is formed, the essence of things will be reflected.

/12302

Fudan Graduate Seminar Discusses Crisis of Marxism

40050341b Shanghai WEN HUI BAO in Chinese 7 Jun 88 p 4

[By Li Ming 2621 7227]

[Text] **The Question of Crisis in Marxist Philosophy**

Fudan University's first-term graduate students specializing in philosophy discussed Marxist philosophy in a recent seminar. Most of them agreed that in the development of theories in China, a so-called crisis actually exists in Marxist philosophy. As to the cause of this crisis and the way to overcome it, however, the participants had many different opinions.

1. Some were of the opinion that the so-called crisis in Marxist philosophy of the present age is caused by the current publication of textbooks on this subject. The system of Marxist philosophy according to these textbooks is mostly based on the old 18th-century materialism. The same traditional theory of knowledge is still used to explain some basic categories of Marxist philosophy, and the system used is based on a Soviet model of the 1930's. Therefore, the use of these textbooks in education obstructs further explorations in Marxist philosophy, and causes a stagnation in the study of Marxism. The only way to overcome this crisis is to get completely out of the entanglement with old materialism, and to search for a new starting point. In other words, we must study Marxism afresh in order to understand Marx and his philosophy.

2. The so-called crisis in Marxist philosophy of the present age can also be attributed to this cause: Marxism no longer enjoys its supreme position as a system of values and faith in people's minds. To overcome this crisis, we should combine our national cultural tradition with the latest ideological trend of Western philosophy and set up a new system of values and faith that is needed by Chinese people in order to eliminate the sense of an impending crisis.

3. After the beginning of the reform and the adoption of an open policy in China, people are more concerned with the economic activities which have a direct bearing on social development, and have the feeling that philosophy is too abstract and far removed from the realities of daily life. That is why philosophy has been neglected. To overcome this situation, we should liberate philosophy from the confines of its abstract form and take the road of philosophical application (such as application of the philosophy of management, philosophy of technology, and so forth), so that philosophy will be more closely related to the realities of social life. Philosophy will then be able to find its proper place in the present society.

4. The so-called crisis in Marxist is essentially a type of political crisis, or a conflict between the realities of social conditions and the old ideology. We must overcome this political crisis before we can remove the sense of crisis in philosophy from people's minds.

9411

More Security for Political Theorists Urged

40050342 Shanghai JIEFANG RIBAO in Chinese 8 Jun 88 p 6

[Article by Deng Weizhi [6772 0251 1807]: "Raise the Coefficient of Political Security for Theorists"]

[Text] If we say that our theoretical work is not rich or vivid enough, one of the important causes may be the low coefficient of political security for the theorists.

The position of theorists in China, as shown in a social cross-section, is not by means low. Some theorists did occupy eminent positions at certain times. Vertically and individually, however, they had their ups and downs. Their positions were even more precarious when "class struggle is taken as the key link." The situation, though much improved in recent years, is still by no means tranquil. Normal academic debates may suddenly be charged as indications of political dissidence and a good book just published may become the primary target of scrutiny. Because of the changes in the political climate, suspension of publication and sales, destruction of the printing plate, replacement of pages and so forth are common sights. In a certain year, for example, a theorist was invited to deliver a lecture. The script was examined in advance, the delivery of the lecture was warmly applauded, and people cordially shook hands with the lecturer. In a news report on this event, however, this theorist was accused of "opposing the CPC Central Committee." Again, when a certain theorist in Shanghai joined the "mass criticism" according to a unified plan, a tabloid with powerful backing accused him of committing the same mistakes which he himself criticized. The theorist and some others did not know whether they should laugh or cry.